REMARKS

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for being indefinite, specifically because the phrase "said nose portion" requires antecedent basis. Claims 1 and 5 are amended to rectify the issue. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 5-10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,386,704 to Wu (hereinafter "Wu").

In relevant part, independent claims 1, 5 and 7 (as well as the remaining dependent claims) all require that the lens include a pair of openings at upper distal end portions of the lens, and that the brow frame extend through the openings. Reference is made to FIGURE 1 of the Applicant's specification, illustrating the brow frame (see portion 42) extending through the opening 34.

Wu does not teaches a frame 1 extending over "latch pieces" 201 of the lens, but not through openings in a lens.

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. 102, a reference must teach every limitation of that claim. Because Wu does not teach this limitation, the independent claims should be allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 11-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,132,041 to Lin (hereinafter "Lin").

Claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1. Claims 11-14 depend from independent claim 7.

As noted above, Wu does not teach the limitations of claims 1 and 7, wherein the brow frame extends through openings in the lens. Lin, like Wu, simply teaches a snap

engagement of the frame on top of the lens, but does not teach the frame extending through openings in the lens.

In order to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness, a proposed combination of prior art references must teach or suggest all of the limitations of the rejected claims. *In re Vaech*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). Because the claimed structure is not found in the cited art, the proposed combination of Wu and Lin is insufficient to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

If there are any charges with respect to this election or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130, maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully Submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN, LLP
Applicant's Attorneys

By: _____
H. M. Bedingfield
Registration No. 44,530

Dated: November 29, 2004
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929